23

24

25

26

HON. ROBERT J. BRYAN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA

C. P., by and through his parents, Patricia Pritchard and Nolle Pritchard; and PATRICIA PRITCHARD,

NO. 3:20-cv-06145-RJB

Plaintiffs,

JOINT STATUS REPORT

v.

BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF ILLINOIS,

Defendant.

I. NATURE AND COMPLEXITY OF THE CASE

Plaintiff's Statement: Plaintiffs C.P. and Patricia Pritchard allege that defendant Blue Cross Blue Shield of Illinois violated Section 1557 of the Affordable Care Act, 42 U.S.C. §18116 and discriminated on the basis of gender, when it administered health benefits that categorically excluded coverage of certain services for treatment of C.P.'s diagnosed condition of gender dysphoria. Plaintiffs seek injunctive relief, damages and other relief as may be granted by the Court.

Plaintiff does not anticipate that this case will involve significant factual disputes. However, it relates to an area of the law that is rapidly evolving. Given the nature of the legal claims, plaintiff expects this case to be moderately complex.

SIRIANNI YOUTZ
SPOONEMORE HAMBURGER PLLC
3101 WESTERN AVENUE, SUITE 350
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98121
TEL. (206) 223-0303 FAX (206) 223-0246

22

23

24

25

26

Defendants' Statement: This action is a claim for health care benefits under a self-insured plan governed by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 ("ERISA") and sponsored by Catholic Health Initiatives. the Exclusion does not violate Title IX or the ACA. The federal regulations and case law upholding those regulations establish that categorical exclusions precluding benefits for gender-affirming surgery and related treatments do not discriminate on the basis of sex. In addition, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act allows the Exclusion because the Plan's sponsor is a Catholic institution. Even if the Plan did not include the Exclusion, the services at issue are not medically necessary for the plaintiff because he is a minor.

II. DEADLINE FOR JOINING ADDITIONAL PARTIES

Plaintiff proposes that the deadline for joining additional parties should be August 5, 2021.

III. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

The parties do not agree that a Magistrate Judge may conduct proceedings.

IV. PROPOSED DISCOVERY PLAN

The parties' counsel held an FRCP 26(f) conference on February 5, 2021.

A. Initial Disclosures

The parties provided their FRCP 26(a) initial disclosures on or before February 16, 2021.

B. Subjects, Timing and Potential Phasing of Discovery

Plaintiffs' Statement: Discovery is likely to relate to the issues raised in the Complaint, including C.P.'s claims and appeals file, Defendants' internal policies and procedures, claims administration and coverage decisions related to BCBSIL's administration of the exclusion of certain benefits in the health benefit plan in which C.P. is enrolled. Plaintiffs do not agree to phasing of discovery.

Defendant's Statement: The Plan at issue is governed by ERISA and ERISA may limit the discovery available. C. **Electronically Stored Information.** The parties anticipate that they will be able to resolve any unanticipated issues involving ESI. D. **Privilege Issues** The parties have not identified any privilege issues at this time. E. **Discovery Limitations** The parties do not agree to any limitations on discovery beyond those provided in the local rules at this time. F. **Discovery Related Orders** At this time, the parties do not believe that any discovery related orders are necessary. V. ISSUES IN LCR 26(F)(1) A. **Prompt Case Resolution** The parties agree that this case cannot be promptly resolved or settled. They further agree that liability will likely be resolved based upon the Court's review of dispositive motions after completion of discovery. В. **ADR** The parties are willing to explore mediation of the dispute pursuant to Local Civil Rule 39.1(c), as described below. C. **Related Cases** The parties are not aware of any related cases. D. **Discovery Management** The parties do not anticipate any additional discovery management issues at this time.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1 1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

25

26

E. Anticipated Discovery Sought

Please see Answer provided in IV.B.

F. Phasing Motions

The parties do not believe that there is a need for phasing of motions. They suggest that a deadline be established for the filing of dispositive motions approximately 60 days after the deadline for the completion of discovery.

G. Preservation of Discoverable Information

The parties have not identified any preliminary issues relating to the preservation of discoverable information.

H. Privilege Issues

The parties agree to handle inadvertent production of privileged information as described in the Model Stipulated Protective Order, ¶9.

I. Model Protocol for Discovery of ESI

The parties agree to adopt the Model Protocol for Discovery of ESI, should it be necessary.

J. Alternatives to the Model Protocol.

No alternative is needed at this time.

VI. DISCOVERY COMPLETED

The parties agree that discovery can be completed by December 3, 2021.

VII. BIFURCATION

No bifurcation is needed.

VIII. PRE-TRIAL STATEMENTS AND ORDERS

No pre-trial statements or orders are needed.

IX. ADR

The parties are willing to explore mediation of the dispute pursuant to Local Civil Rule 39.1 (c), although mediation would be most productive after anticipated motions

for summary judgment on key legal issues in the case. The parties do not agree to use 1 the Individualized Trial Program set forth in Local Civil Rule 39.2. 2 3 X. SUGGESTIONS FOR SIMPLIFYING CASE The parties have no other suggestions for simplifying the case. 4 5 XI. TRIAL DATE This matter will be ready for trial on or after March 14, 2022. 6 7 XII. This case will be tried before the Court. 8 9 XIII. TRIAL DAYS REQUIRED If a trial is necessary, the parties anticipate that 4 days would be needed. 10 1 1 XIV. TRIAL COUNSEL Counsel for plaintiffs: 12 13 Eleanor Hamburger Richard E. Spoonemore 14 SIRIANNI YOUTZ SPOONEMORE HAMBURGER PLLC 15 3101 Western Avenue, Suite 350 16 Seattle, WA 98121 Tel. (206) 223-0303; Fax (206) 223-0246 17 18 Omar Gonzalez-Pagan LAMBDA LEGAL DEFENSE AND 19 EDUCATION FUND, INC. 120 Wall Street, 19th Floor 20 New York, NY 10005 21 Tel. (212) 809-8585; Fax (212) 809-0055 22 Jennifer C. Pizer LAMBDA LEGAL DEFENSE AND 23 EDUCATION FUND, INC. 24 4221 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 280 Los Angeles, California 90010 25 Tel. (213) 382-7600; Fax (213) 351-6050 26

SIRIANNI YOUTZ
SPOONEMORE HAMBURGER PLLC
3101 WESTERN AVENUE, SUITE 350
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98121
TEL. (206) 223-0303 FAX (206) 223-0246

Counsel for defendant: 1 Gwendolyn C. Payton 2 KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP 3 1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3700 Seattle, WA 98101 4 Tel. (206) 626-7713; Fax (206) 260-8946 5 XV. SCHEDULING COMPLICATIONS 6 The parties are not aware of any scheduling complications at this time. 7 XVI. ADDITIONAL SERVICE 8 All Defendants have been served. 9 **XVII. SCHEDULING CONFERENCE** 10 The parties agree that no scheduling conference is required. 1 1 XVIII. CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT 12 Defendant Blue Cross Blue Shield of Illinois filed its corporate disclosure 13 statement on November 30, 2020. 14 DATED: February 22, 2021. 15 16 KILPATRICK TOWNSEND SIRIANNI YOUTZ & STOCKTON LLP SPOONEMORE HAMBURGER PLLC 17 /s/ Gwendolyn C. Payton /s/ Eleanor Hamburger 18 Gwendolyn C. Payton (WSBA # 26752) Eleanor Hamburger (WSBA #26478) Attorneys for Blue Cross Blue Shield of 19 LAMBDA LEGAL DEFENSE AND Illinois 20 EDUCATION FUND, INC. Attorneys for Counsel for Defendant 21 /s/ Omar Gonzalez-Pagan Health Care Service Corporation, a Mutual Omar Gonzalez-Pagan, pro hac vice Legal Reserve Company, doing business in 22 Jennifer C. Pizer, pro hac vice Illinois as Blue Cross and Blue Shield of 23 Illinois Attorneys for Plaintiffs 24 25 26

JOINT STATUS REPORT - 6 [Case No. 3:20-cv-06145-RJB] SIRIANNI YOUTZ
SPOONEMORE HAMBURGER PLLC
3101 WESTERN AVENUE, SUITE 350
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98121
TEL. (206) 223-0303 FAX (206) 223-0246